

Discussion Issues

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
A. Community Character & Historic Preservation and Urban Centers – Downtown Section (Policies, Exhibit A)		
What is the relationship of the proposed policy amendments to the Transportation Master Plan (TMP): Are they consistent with and/or guided by the TMP? -(Miller)	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> The community’s vision guides the development of the City’s priorities and the Comprehensive Plan. From these, the City developed its guiding principles and the overarching transportation vision. Using this citywide transportation vision, five transportation strategies were developed as part of the 2013 TMP update. Each of the five strategies describes core activities needed to achieve desired outcomes. The five strategies provide the basis for identifying projects and programs to be completed by 2030. Implementation activities needed to achieve each strategy will also be guided by the sustainability principles of safety, maintenance, environmental stewardship and economic vitality.</p> <p>The five transportation strategies are found in TMP Chapter 1, on page 3 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prepare for Light Rail• Ensure Strong Support for Urban Centers• Improve Travel Choices and Mobility• Increase Neighborhood Connections• Enhance Freight Mobility <p>Below is an analysis of how the proposed policy amendments and proposed new policies would facilitate the TMP strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proposed new policy CC-32(b) speaks to a plan that would continue to provide strategies and support for the Downtown’s urban center.• Proposed new policy DT-25(b) is consistent with the TMP urban center strategy by calling for design standards that address high quality and complementary designs as	Opened 7/8

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 10, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>well as ensuring the creation of an engaging pedestrian experience in the Historic Core.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proposed amendments to existing policy DT-28 and DT-29 and proposed new policy DT-30(b) and DT-30(d) support the TMP urban center and light rail strategies particularly by calling for seating and landscaping as components of the streetscape, by calling for landscaping between on-site parking and the pedestrian realm, and by encouraging other outdoor seating, dining, landscaping, and coordinated waste disposal in the context of pedestrian activity and the future Downtown light rail station.• Proposed new policy DT-30(c) supports the TMP urban center strategy by calling for visibility for and connection to the commercially-based Historic Core, particularly from Downtown Park.• Proposed new policy DT-25(b), amendment to policy DT-28 and DT-29, and new policies DT-30(b), (c) and (d) support travel choices and mobility associated with the Historic Core and may provide some support for connections. <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
B. Tripartite Architecture and Design (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 19 to 32)		
<p>At what threshold would the new standards apply when renovating a structure?</p> <p>- (Murray, Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioners asked if implementation of the proposed new standards would be required in the case of a tenant improvement to a building or a minor exterior renovation. They asked staff to provide more information of what threshold of renovation would require the application of the proposed new standards.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> Staff's response and recommendation regarding thresholds in this section of the issues matrix will also include thresholds regarding material, listed in section C. Material, item #1. Staff will provide additional information on this item.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> How will amendments affect existing buildings? At what point such as</p>	<p>Opened 7/8</p>

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 10, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	during tenant improvements will the new design standards become requirement? (Johnson)	
C. Materials (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 6 to 10)		
At what threshold would the new standards apply when renovating a structure? -(Murray, Biethan)	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> (See also, item B. above) Commissioners asked if implementation of the proposed new standards would be required in the case of a tenant improvement to a building or a minor exterior renovation. They asked staff to provide more information of what threshold of renovation would require the application of the proposed new standards. <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> Staff's response and recommendations regarding threshold, warrants, and triggers related to proposed design standards is addressed in section B. Tripartite Architecture and Design, item #1 in this issue matrix. <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 7/8
D. Pedestrian System Map Amendment – Historic Core Pedestrian Connection (Exhibit B, Attachment 3)		
What is the purpose of the proposed Pedestrian Connection and how will it function? -(Miller)	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> 4-Mobility <u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioner Miller asked if the proposed new east/west pedestrian connection will support pedestrian mobility and requested more information on how the connection is proposed to function, especially without proposed mid-block crossings on Leary Way and Gilman Street. <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 7/8

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 10, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
E. Pedestrian System Map Amendment – Leary Way Width (Exhibit B, Attachment 3)		
What is the appropriate cross-section for Leary Way and how should we accommodate parking and pedestrian mobility? What is the relationship to mobility needs in the context of future light rail? What is the relationship to parking? - (Miller)	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria: 4-Mobility, 5-Parking</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> Staff will provide additional information on this item. <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 7/8
F. Pedestrian System Map Amendment – Gilman Street (Exhibit B, Attachment 3)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Should Gilman be closed to auto traffic? Seems that current use is more in line with parking versus for through trips. Should the street create a place for people? (Buhlman)	
G. Pedestrian Experience and Streetscape Elements (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 21 to 27)		

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 10, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment:</u> Can and how can the sidewalk along Leary Way be improved? Pavers have been damaged and tree grates seem to need maintenance and/or updating. (Sherpa)	
H. Building Corners and Entries (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 13 to 18)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	
I. Building Windows (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 10 to 13)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	
J. Signs (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, Attachment		

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 10, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
6)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	
K. Building Height (tbd)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	
L. Building Mass (tbd)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	
M. Building Stepbacks (tbd)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u>	

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 10, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	
Additional Topics		

Questions

1. Question? (Commissioner{s})

Answer/reply/information